



06-17-2006 #61

tkkclark
Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** ▾

Crispus or somebody mentioned this article earlier. You might want to read it before we go forward as it will likely address many of your questions.

<http://www.scripturaltruths.com/teachings/holyspirit/>

Ack! More homework, LOL! Nah, I'm joking. Thank you. I will print this out and read over Barnes today as well.

06-17-2006 #62

tkkclark
Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** ▾

Gen
31:20 - is decieved
31:36 - is decieved
34:3 - spoke to

Ex
25:2 - impels

Num
32:7 - discouraged

Deut.
2:30 - emboldened
15:10 - grieved

Prov
5:12 - despises
6:18 - plots
14:10 - knows
15:28 - learns
16:9 - plans

18:12 - *is haughty*
 18:15 - *gets knowledge*
 19:3 - *rages*
 23:15 - *is wise*
 23:17 - *envies*
 23:23 - *speaks*
 24:2 - *studies*
 24:17 - *is glad*
 27:11 - *has joy*
 21:11 - *trusts*

Ecc

1:13 - *seeks and investigates*
 1:16 - *spoken to and sees*
 1:17 - *knows*
 2:10 - *rejoices*
 7:22 - *knows*
 8:5 - *knows*
 11:9 - *glad*

As the examples I listed show, the heart is assigned personal characteristics as often if not more so than the Holy Spirit, and I didn't even come close to providing all of the examples. It is not limited to poetic books, but it is common.

Just to clarify...I don't recall if I said it or not, but if I did, I did not **mean** that personifications are **limited** to the poetic and prophetic books. I meant that figurative language is concentrated in those books and we can reasonably expect to find such figurative language there. If I in any way made that unclear, I apologize and will seek to be more precise in future.

The examples you listed above for heart are primarily from the poetic books. Where we can reasonably expect to find poetic language.

My point is that a demanded personification of the Holy Spirit would not exist primarily in the poetic and prophetic books, but would saturate the entirety of Scripture. Not just in poetry, per se, but also in simple narrative and as I think George Smeaton said, didactic instruction. When you consider personifications (and indeed figurative language as a whole), examples primarily occur in the poets and the prophets. It occurs much less so in other books.

Furthermore, we find a far greater preponderance of literal usage of a word than we do figurative applications. Jerusalem is spoken of literally a great deal more than it is spoken of in a figurative sense, etc. The Christian Think Tank addresses this issue at <http://www.christian-thinktank.com/trin04b.html> :

Quote:

To put this a bit in perspective, let us remember that figurative uses of a term are DEPENDENT on the literal usages of the term. To see WHICH is the basis for the other (i.e. the personal as a personification of the impersonal, OR the impersonal as an 'effect from the cause' from the personal) we need to review the relative frequency of each usage. For example, in the case of "sin" the number of impersonal passages in the NT are around 200--the verses that portray sin as personal are numbered below 10. This would (barring other special factors) indicate that the IMPERSONAL was more primary (and hence, the basis for) the PERSONAL usages.

In the case of the Holy Spirit, the OPPOSITE is the case. Of the cases in which the Spirit is definitely either described impersonally (e.g. 'pour out' , 'on me', a 'seal', a 'deposit'), or personally (e.g. thinking, teaching, speaking, warning, being grieved, etc.)--the PERSONAL references (in Acts-Jude) outnumber the IMPERSONAL ones by a factor of 5! And the 'personal action' verses also outnumber the 'not-sure' usages (e.g. 'filled with', 'given') by approximately 2 to 1. From normal canons of literary criticism, this would indicate that the PERSONAL characteristics of the Spirit are used as the basis for the other--i.e., the Spirit is considered a personal agent by the writers.

The link also addresses figurative language (poured out, etc) applied to the Holy Spirit.



06-17-2006

#63

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 816
 13 Reputation Points



The only reason that the list I provided was primarily seen in poetic literature was because that is also I had original put together. When you observed that the reference I had made I decided to add some other references to show that it is all over the place.

I could not find anything that addressed the holy spirit being poured out in that link. Granted I just did a search, but in doing that I only found one reference and it made a rather weak argument without addressing the text itself.



06-17-2006

#64

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 816
 13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark** *My point is -- and remains -- that association with impersonal entities does not demand nor require impersonality.*

It is not mere "association" but contrast.

Quote:

I disagree with the commentators. LOL.

You are welcome to do that, but if your own commentators (i.e. Trinitarians) do not all agree with the argument you put forth, it can hardly be a "proof."

Quote:

When I said Holy Spirit, I was not quoting Scripture. (For future reference, when I quote Scripture, I use italics.) My position is the Spirit referred to in [Acts 8:29](#) is the Holy Spirit. I'd hardly agree that commenting on my own position is an error.

Well that is the issue I am questioning. There is nothing specific to the text that demands that it be the Holy Spirit and not the angel.

Quote:

Furthermore, you failed to address my point(s). The angel tells Phillip where to go at the start of the journey. The Spirit appears later, once Phillip reaches his destination. Different places, different times. Nothing in the text demands or requires us to refer back earlier in the account, to an entirely different place and time.

It would make sense that it is the same angel though. The fact that it is a different time and place does not stop the angel from returning. In light of the context it would be natural for the angel to return.

Quote:

Btw, unless I am mistaken, commentators are in agreement on this.

I haven't sufficiently researched the commentators on this to tell one way or another. But it is interesting to look at a couple of those that do take it as the Holy Spirit. For example Clarke does take it as such but he does not take there to be a voice. He explains: "It is likely that what the Spirit did in this case was by a strong impression on his mind, which left him no doubt of its being from God."

Quote:

Unless I am mistaken, you think I am arguing the specific quotations I referred to in the book of Revelation? I am not. I said what I originally said to argue that appealing Revelation was not a bad idea (or however you phrased it). I **did not** say that the fact that direct speech is in apocalyptic lit proves the Holy Spirit spoke. Only that direct speech exists in apocalyptic lit so we **can** appeal to apocalyptic lit when considering direct speech.

But again. That begs the question. Is this direct speech or isn't it? 😊

Quote:

The point is -- and remains -- what the definition of "says" in that particular passage means. I c/p the definition and it indicates "to say, to speak." The definition does not include "to impress upon the mind by inspiration" or some such.

Actually it does. There is no basis for saying that this particular passage means "to say, to speak." Commentators Acknowledge that it does include the thought of pressing upon the mind. See what I just referenced from Clarke.

Quote:

But...Would you care to elaborate as to why sharing a single name is modalism? Modalism is the belief that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are the same person. Trinitarianism is the belief that the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are distinct persons, yet one God. Multiple persons sharing the same name does not demand that each is the same person. My position is that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are distinct persons who share the same, singular name as one God. Then again...Given that this thread is about the Holy Spirit, not the Trinity, perhaps we're sidetracking the thread.

Well again, to be baptized "into the name" of a one is to be baptized "into" that person. That is to be dedicated to that one. It is to accept that one in your life. So it is to be baptized into the office of that one. It would mean that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all share one office, when we know that Jesus isn't

the Father, etc.

Quote:

Mondo, in a previous thread you cited Origen as a proof for the archetypal sense of alethinous in [John 17:3](#). Origen was an ANF. Are you now saying we should disregard what Origen (and other ANFs) wrote because they were heretics? Turning to the ANFs for insight into the beliefs of the early church is rather common and you have done so yourself.

You'll note that I cited him exclusively for insight into the meaning of a word, not for theological matters.

Quote:

The ANFs were human, fallible, their writings uninspired. Contemporary commentators disagree at times as well. I disagree with fellow Christians on certain points, for that matter. The fact that Christians at times disagree does not mean we should toss out a blanket accusation of heresy and totally disregard them, at least not without evidence supporting such an accusation.

That is true. But they should not be counted as having any more authority than modern commentators because of the fact that they are fallible.

Quote:

I consult the ANFs, just as I consult contemp commentators like John Gill. There is nothing wrong with that.

I do the same, so I definitely agree with that.

Quote:

Every time you say a reasonable person or anyone with common sense **must** agree with your position, you attack the opposing party, not the merit of the argument. Rather than addressing the issue, you denigrate the intelligence, reasoning capacity, etc of the opposing party him/herself.

My point is merely to parallel the two.

Quote:

Frankly, I'm offended at your presumptuousness.

Well I certainly apologize for offending you.

Quote:

The article further discusses the personality of the Holy Spirit in the early church. Admittedly, I haven't studied personification in the ANFs, but limited my study to the Bible, but...Exactly how common is personification in simple narrative? How common outside the poets and the prophets? In the historical books of the OT? Hm.

It is actually quite common. It is also seen outside of Scripture. [Judges 9](#) is a nice parable that makes use of vivid personification.

Ephesians 4:10 *He who descended is Himself also He who ascended far above all the heavens, so that **He might fill all things.*** (NASB; emphasis mine)

Jesus (who descended and ascended) fills all things. He's a person. [/quote]

It doesn't say that all things were filled with Jesus, but that Jesus would fill them. Notice Clarke: "That he might be the fountain whence all blessings might flow..."

Quote:

Acts 5:3 *But Peter said, "Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and to keep back some of the price of the land?" (NASB)*

Satan filled Ananias' heart. Satan's a person.

Satan filled his heart, his heart wasn't filled with Satan. Big difference.

Ephesians 3:19 *and to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled up to all the fullness of God. (NASB)*

Please consult Barnes' commentary for his analysis, as it very much agrees with mine. [/quote]

Barnes seems to offer multiple interpretations and somehow claim that it means all of those things, which itself is unlikely. Logically Paul had a specific meaning in mind. The expression "the fullness of God" likely carries one of two meanings. The Expositor's Greek Testament states: "The QEOU may be the gen. of origination cause, = the fulness bestowed by God; or better, the poos. gen., = the fulness possessed by God." Not a reference to God himself, but what God possesses and gives.

This is most logical in context, for if we start in verse 14 the discussion is of the things God gives. He gives these things "that you may be filled to all the fullness of God."

Quote:

How are believers literally annointed, per [2 Cor 1:21](#)? I don't know about you, but to date, no one has used oil on me. And again, please note the verbs used. If you like, I'll c/p the definitions.

Also, in regards to Jesus' baptism:

Mt 3:16 *...and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: (KJV; emphasis mine)*

You're presuming that the Holy Spirit's role was described in literal rather than figurative terms. Was the Holy Spirit a literal dove? Or is the Holy Spirit described to be **like** (Strongs 5616; Gr. hosei) a dove?

[/quote]

Just as oil is poured out, so is the Holy Spirit. The Spirit takes the place of the oil, for the oil itself served only as a symbol. Hence the pouring out of the spirit is compared to the pouring out of water.

Now obviously the Spirit was not a literal dove, but it was seen as such. It was probably a vision of sorts.



tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275


18 Reputation Points



This point merits its own post as it relates to the process of debate more so than the particular point debated. The matter is of vital importance because the manner in which we debate and what constitutes a valid logical argument is not limited to this thread only, but applies to any debate we may pursue in future.

You said:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** 
...but if your own commentators (i.e. Trinitarians) do not all agree with the argument you put forth, it can hardly be a "proof."

Exactly how many commentators, lexicons, dictionaries and encyclopedias do you own or have access to? Not the more rare and esoteric, mind you. I mean reputable, commonly cited sources. Dozens? Me, too. I've never actually counted, but I could easily name half a dozen dictionaries I regularly consult alone. Which says nothing of grammars, histories, systematic theologies, the ANFs (you know I had to include them...he he he) and topic-specific books by contemporary scholars such as Harris' *Jesus As God*, Hurtado, etc.

Would you not agree we have a **vast** scope of resources -- widely respected resources -- in which to consult?

Who wrote these books? Fallible, imperfect men (and women), just like you and I. They made/make mistakes and err, again just like you and I. At times, they disagree. Just like you and I.

Frankly, unless one considers these sources or the authors of them infallible (I do not), there is no reason to expect or demand that all of them must uniformly agree.

Have you ever reviewed logical fallacies of debate? If not, I rather enjoy Debating 101 - Logical Fallacies at <http://www.geocities.com/phineasbg/kirklogic.html> (principally because I find the Trekkie theme to the examples employed both insightful and amusing). Under Changing the Subject, see #2 Appeal to Authority, b. Experts in the field disagree, which I quote:

Quote:

If there is a significant amount of legitimate dispute among the experts within a subject, then it will [sic] fallacious to make an Appeal to Authority using the disputing experts. This is because for almost any claim being made and "supported" by one expert there will be a counterclaim that is made and "supported" by another expert. In such cases an Appeal to Authority would tend to be futile. **In such cases, the dispute has to be settled by consideration of the actual issues under dispute...**

It is important to keep in mind that **no field has complete agreement, so some degree of dispute is acceptable...**It is also important to keep in mind that even a field with a great deal of internal dispute might contain areas of significant agreement...

(All emphasis mine.)

You said:

Quote:

I appeal to them as hostile witnesses to show that there is more than one way to look at a text...

If a matter we disagree about has conflicting commentary, either you or I **should** say as much and since the commentators disagree, neither one of us should appeal to them to support our respective positions. As indicated in the quote from Debating 101, we should instead consider the matter under dispute. I said as much previously:

Quote:

Commentators disagreed. Fine. I won't appeal to them for authority and neither should you. Let's discuss between us (without appealing to these commentators for authority) the passage at hand then.

But you also said:

Quote:

...and so that the texts don't actually prove anything at all.

You haven't shown **my position** to be false, not at all. You've simply shown that **appealing to authority** would be fallacious.

The merit (or lack thereof) of my position is not contingent upon the uniform agreement of commentators. You seem to believe that disagreement among commentators negates my position. It does not. As indicated in the Debating 101 quote, no field has complete agreement and while individual commentators may disagree in the interpretation of specific verses, they all believe the Holy Spirit is a person. Conflicting commentaries proves only that these authorities should not be cited as supporting evidence. That's it.

Demanding that authorities must unanimously and uniformly agree with my position as a measure of validating my position is a logical fallacy, pure and simple.

Now, back to your regularly scheduled program...

p.s. I'll address the actual points we are debating when I'm **not** on my way to church and already running late, LOL



06-18-2006

#66

tkkclark


Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** 
Crispus or somebody mentioned this article earlier. You might want to read it before we go forward as it will likely address many of your questions.

<http://www.scripturaltruths.com/teachings/holyspirit/>

The material in this link is practically identical to most (though not all, at least not yet, LOL) arguments you've presented here. Although I disagree with the content, I thank you for posting the link, as (I hope) it's helped me understand

your position(s) better. That's not saying I **agree** with your position(s), mind, but improved understanding can lead to improved dialogue, yes?

Last edited by tkkclark : 06-18-2006 at 12:37 PM. Reason: typo



06-18-2006

#67

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

In the 1st century the OT was the inspired text that they worked with. There were no further revelations at the start of it.

Quote:

Originally Posted by [tkkclark](#)
If so, this should simplify supplying evidence that supports your position that the Holy Spirit would be assumed to be impersonal in the 1st century.

Bump. I assume you're preparing the evidence since you haven't ceded the point, but I don't want this to get lost in the thread...



06-18-2006

#68

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
The only reason that the list I provided was primarily seen in poetic literature was because that is also I had original put together. When you observed that the reference I had made I decided to add some other references to show that it is all over the place.

I understand. I've taken research prepared for another matter entirely before myself and we've got so many arguments going on at once here, I can hardly blame you for saving what time you can.

However, I've potentially stumbled upon a weakness in both my argument and yours when it comes to our consideration of heart as a personification. I'll withhold my comments, however, until I've finished my analysis and ask for your patience while I complete that analysis.

Quote:

I could not find anything that addressed the holy spirit being poured out in that link. Granted I just did a search, but in doing that **I only found one reference** and it made a rather weak argument without addressing the text itself.

Please note the emphasis above (mine). "I couldn't find anything" and "I only found one reference" are mutually exclusive. You either found something or you didn't. The fact that you apparently feel the reference is "weak" does not negate the existence of the reference.

In any event, the note I made about figurative language **also** being addressed was only one sentence and by virtue of "also" (and the subject matter of the

lengthy quote), not even my main purpose in posting the link. The main point, which you failed to address, is the relative frequency of personification regarding personal vs. impersonal applications and how a demanded personification of the Holy Spirit would not reflect the pattern we see in personification (i.e. a far, far greater preponderance of impersonal usage) in Scripture. Do you intend to respond to this at all or do you cede the point?

Last edited by tkkclark : 06-18-2006 at 01:13 PM. Reason: typo again



06-18-2006

#69

tkkclark


Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** 
It is not mere "association" but contrast.

Yes...And? Sarx is, admittedly, representative of our earthly, sinful nature. The Spirit "lusts" against that sinful nature. I fail to understand why that demands the Holy Spirit must be impersonal.

Barnes says:

Quote:

The inclinations and desires of the flesh are contrary to those of the Spirit. They draw us away in an opposite direction, and while the Spirit of God would lead us one way, our carnal nature would lead us another, and thus produce the painful controversy which exists in our minds. The word "Spirit" here refers to the Spirit of God, and to his influences on the heart.

And John Gill says:

Quote:

the Arabic version renders it, "for the flesh desires that which militates against the Spirit, and the Spirit desires that which militates against the flesh"; to which the Ethiopic version agrees, reading it thus, "for the flesh desires what the Spirit would not, and the Spirit desires what the flesh would not"

And finally Robertson's Word Pictures says:

Quote:

Lusteth against (*epithumei kata*). Like a tug of war. **This use of sarx as opposed to the Spirit (Holy Spirit) personifies sarx.** Lightfoot argues that epithumei cannot be used with the Spirit and so some other verb must be supplied for it. But that is wholly needless, for the verb, like epithumia, does not mean evil desire, but simply to long for. Christ and Satan long for the possession of the city of Man Soul as Bunyan shows.

(Emphasis above mine.)

Quote:

There is nothing specific to the text that demands that it be the Holy Spirit and not the angel.

I will discuss the Holy Spirit's identification when (if?) I ever finish answering

these arguments, time allowing. However, I can say there is nothing "specific to the text" that demands that the speaker in [Acts 8:29](#) is the angel. You asserted that the angel spoke in [Acts 8:29](#) so you bear the burden of proof. Thus far, you have failed to prove that the angel is the speaker.

Quote:

It would make sense that it is the same angel though.

There is absolutely nothing in the text that implies or infers that the speaker is the angel. "It would make sense" is an unsupported, unsubstantiated opinion. Not proof.

Quote:

The fact that it is a different time and place does not stop the angel from returning.

No, but the text does. Nothing in the text indicates the angel returned. Nothing.

This is an argument from silence, a logical fallacy. In effect, you assert since the text doesn't explicitly say that the angel didn't return, that there's no proof that the angel didn't do so. I don't have to prove the angel didn't return, Mondo. But to support your position, you do have to prove that the angel was there **to** speak. **The text does not support your argument.**

Quote:

In light of the context it would be natural for the angel to return.

In light of **what** context? The angel tells Phillip which way to go. Once he reaches his destination, the text indicates that the Spirit speaks. Period.

Quote:

But again. That begs the question. Is this direct speech or isn't it? 😊

Please. I beg of you. Sincerely. Read this **very** carefully.

I want you to forget, for a moment, that I ever cited Revelation in regards to the Holy Spirit. Pluck it from your brain. For just a few minutes, pretend those references no longer exist.

Now, you said that considering Revelation and apocalyptic lit was not a "safe way" to go given "the type of language" used in the genre. I answered -- defending my appeal to Revelation only, not any specific reference -- that although the genre is chock full of symbolism, etc, there **are** instances of direct speech. Before you get side-tracked by the Holy Spirit again, allow me to make this as clear as I possibly can -- there **are** instances of direct speech attributed to Jesus, John, God the Father, various angels, etc.

Do you agree that people, for instance John and/or Jesus, speak directly in apocalyptic lit, including Revelation? I'm not talking about the Holy Spirit here, but people whose personality you **do** recognize. Does Jesus speak directly? John? Does anybody? Or do you believe **all** speech in apocalyptic lit is indirect?

If you don't believe direct speech can occur at all in apocaylyptic lit, my approach to the argument would necessarily differ from that of arguing for direct speech of the Holy Spirit alone. Though it may seem a trifling matter on the surface, it does effect how I proceed with my argument which is why I've been so dogged in at least trying to clarify your position.

I'll refrain from commenting further until you indicate whether or not you agree that direct speech from **anyone** exists in apocalyptic lit.

Quote:

Actually it does. There is no basis for saying that this particular passage means "to say, to speak." Commentators Acknowledge that it does include the thought of pressing upon the mind. See what I just referenced from Clarke.

I quoted the lexicon at Studylight.org, which states "to say, to speak" **is** the definition. Contrary to what you claim above, unless you can prove I'm misrepresented/misquoted the source or prove the source isn't an authority, that **is** a basis. It's not just the basis -- it's the word-for-word definition. (More on this later...)

Quote:

Well again, to be baptized "into the name" of a one is to be baptized "into" that person. That is to be dedicated to that one. It is to accept that one in your life. So it is to be baptized into the office of that one. It would mean that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all share one office, when we know that Jesus isn't the Father, etc.

Mondo, [Mat 28:19](#) is one of the Trinity prooftexts, as I'm sure you're well aware. I'm not using it as such here, but you know as well as I do that I could provide overwhelming quotations that more than adequately illustrate exactly how the Trinitarian position is reflected in this verse. Since you directed me to Barnes to understand your position, though, I'll quote him:

Quote:

...To be baptized in the name of the Father, etc., is the same as to be baptized "unto" the Father; as to believe on the "name" of Christ is the same as to believe "on Christ,"...To be baptized "unto" anyone is publicly to receive and adopt him as a religious teacher or lawgiver; to receive his system of religion. Thus, the Jews were baptized "unto Moses," 1Co 10:2. That is, they received the system that he taught; they acknowledged him as their lawgiver and teacher. So Paul asks 1Co_1:13, "Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" - that is, Were you devoted to Paul by this rite? Did you bind yourselves to "him," and give yourselves away to "him," or to God? So to be baptized in the name of the Father, or unto the Father, means publicly, by a significant rite, to receive his system of religion; to bind the soul to obey his laws; to be devoted to him; to receive, as the guide and comforter of the life, his instructions, and to trust to his promises. To be baptized unto the Son, in like manner, is to receive him as the Messiah - our Prophet, Priest, and King - to submit to his laws, and to receive him as a Saviour. To be baptized unto the Holy Spirit is to receive him publicly as the Sanctifier, Comforter, and Guide of the soul. The meaning, then, may be thus expressed: Baptizing them unto the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit by a solemn profession of the only true religion, and by a solemn consecration to the service of the sacred Trinity.

The union of these three names in the form of baptism proves that the Son and Holy Spirit are equal with the Father. Nothing would be more absurd or blasphemous than to unite the name of a creature - a man or an angel - with the name of the ever-living God in this solemn rite. If Jesus was a mere man or an angel, as is held by many who deny his divinity, and **if the Holy Spirit was a mere "attribute" of God, then it would have been the height of absurdity to use a form like this, or**

to direct the apostles to baptize people under them. How absurd would be the direction - nay, how blasphemous - to have said, "Baptize them unto God, and unto Paul, and unto the "wisdom or power" of God!" Can we believe that our Saviour would have given a direction so absurd as this? Yet, unless he himself is divine, and the Holy Spirit is divine, Jesus gave a direction substantially the same as this. The form of baptism, therefore, has been always regarded as an unbreakable argument for the doctrine of the Trinity, or that the Son and Holy Spirit are equal with the Father.

Albert Barnes expounds on the meaning of baptizing in the name, which you indicated explained **your** definition of the same, but Albert Barnes certainly doesn't take this definition to preclude the personality of the Holy Spirit and in fact, in the very same passage, comments quite emphatically against considering him impersonal.

As I said previously, Trinitarians (or at least this Trinitarian) believe(s) the single name under which we are baptized refers to God, as one being. The fact that God is one being does not deny that God exists in three distinct persons.

Quote:

You'll note that I cited him exclusively for insight into the meaning of a word, not for theological matters.

Point taken.

Please don't assume that I'm avoiding any of the remaining points you raised. I'm exceeding character limits...Ack!



06-18-2006

#70

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



As I understand it -- and I may very well be wrong -- the only objections you've raised to the Holy Spirit being the Spirit referred to in in [Acts 8:29](#) is the (thus far) unsubstantiated argument that the Spirit is actually the angel referred to in [Acts 8:26](#) and that the Spirit is referred to as *ho pneuma*, not *ho pneuma haigos*, *ho pneuma ho haigos* and/or that *pneuma* does not include other additional qualifiers. If I am mistaken, please correct me.

The Holy Spirit **is** referred to as *ho pneuma* and as *ho pneuma* alone over two dozen times in the New Testament.

I limited my search to occurrences of *ho pneuma*, without additional qualifiers such as *haigos*, *kurios*, *theos*, etc. I then eliminated all verses in which commentaries conflict (**without** conceding the argument in these occurrences, but to focus the argument). I also eliminated any verse in which I saw a referant with a descriptive identifier in the immediate context and consulted cross references to eliminate any verse in which a parallel passage included *haigos* or any other additional qualifier. The remaining verses are:

[Luke 4:14](#)

[John 3:6, 8, 34](#)

[Acts 10:19, 11:12, 11:28](#)

[2 Corinthians 1:22, 5:5](#)

[Galatians 3:2, 5; 5:17 \(twice\), 22; 6:8 \(twice\)](#)

[Ephesians 6:17](#)

[1 Timothy 4:1](#)

[1 John 3:24](#)

[Revelation 2:7, 11, 17, 29](#); 3:6, 13, 22; 14:13; 22:17

(I, of course, removed [Acts 8:29](#) from this list.)

The above accounts for over two dozen occasions in the New Testament in which the Holy Spirit is referred to as *ho pneuma* without referents that include additional qualifiers in the immediate context and in which the commentaries (Barnes, Clarke, Gill, JFB. Also RWP and VWS) uniformly agree *ho pneuma* refers to the Holy Spirit.

This establishes that the Holy Spirit is known by *ho pneuma* and *ho pneuma* alone in Scripture and needs no additional qualifiers to be identified as such.

[Acts 8:29](#) states that *ho pneuma* is the speaker. *Ho pneuma* is the Holy Spirit.



Post Reply

Page 4 of 4 < 1 2 3 4 ▾

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Quick Reply

Message:

X | **B** | *I* | U | **A** ▾ | | |

| |

Please click one of the Quick Reply icons in the posts above to activate Quick Reply.

Options

Quote message in reply?

Post Quick Reply

Go Advanced

Posting Rules

You **may** post new threads
 You **may** post replies
 You **may not** post attachments
 You **may** edit your posts

[vB code](#) is **On**
[Smilies](#) are **On**
[\[IMG\]](#) code is **On**
 HTML code is **Off**

All times are GMT -4. The time now is 08:06 AM.
 As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,355,721, Page Views Today: 22,355,721

-- Default Style

[Contact Us](#) - [Christian Discussion Forums](#) - [Archive](#) - [To](#)

Copyright ©2000 - 2007, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.
copyright CARM 2006,2007
Get Weather for any City, State, Zipcode, or Country:

Fast Forecast